UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,293	10/14/2003	W. Todd Daniell	190250-1550	7097

38823 7590 02/05/2007
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/
BELLSOUTH I.P. CORP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY
SUITE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339

EXAMINER	
HOANG, HIEU T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	**Application No.** 10/686,293	**Applicant(s)** DANIELL, W. TODD
	Examiner Hieu T. Hoang	**Art Unit** 2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 11-14, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldman (US 2003/0233418).

3. For claim 1, Goldman fully discloses an email system for providing email service to a user (abstract), comprising:

- an email client to retrieve email messages from a mail server of the user (fig. 1, recipient's computer 12, STMP server 14, server 15);
- a plurality of detection mechanisms that detect undesired email messages from the retrieved mail ([0039], filter module 24 filters out unsolicited e-mails by referencing sender's addresses, fig. 4, 3 schemes of authorizing sender's e-mails); and
- a single graphical user interface control to provide, to the user, access to each of the detection mechanisms from one graphical display (fig. 3A, 3B, user interface 32, [0041]).

4. For claim 11, Goldman fully discloses a system for providing email service (abstract), comprising:

- means for providing a plurality of detection mechanisms for detecting undesired email messages ([0039], filter module 24 filters out unsolicited e-mails by referencing sender's addresses, fig. 4, 3 schemes of authorizing sender's e-mails); and
- means for providing access to each of the detection mechanisms from a single graphical interface control said each of the detection mechanisms may be configured and activated from the single graphical interface control (fig. 3A, 3B, user interface 32, [0041]).

5. For claim 19, Goldman fully discloses a method for providing email service (abstract), comprising the steps of:

- providing a plurality of detection approaches for detecting undesired email messages ([0039], filter module 24 filters out unsolicited e-mails by referencing sender's addresses, fig. 4, 3 schemes of authorizing sender's e-mails);
- providing access to each of the detection approaches from a single graphical interface control said each of the detection approaches may be configured and activated from the single graphical interface control (fig. 3A, 3B, user interface 32, [0041]).

6. For claims 2, 12, and 20, Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email message is not on a list of senders authorized by the user (fig. 4, unconfirmed category includes any sender's address that has not been categorized as authorized, [0044] lines 19-23).

7. For claims 3, 13, and 21, Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email is on a list of unauthorized senders (fig. 4, unauthorized category, [0052] lines 1-8).

8. For claims 4, 14, and 22, Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that detects an email message if the email message contains a textual content string that is on a list of unauthorized textual content strings ([0006] lines 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 5-6, 10, 15-16, 18, 23-24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman as applied to claims 1, 11, and 19 above, in view of Gordon et al. (US 6,732,157, hereafter Gordon)

11. For claims 5 and 23, Goldman discloses the invention substantially as claimed as described in claims 1 and 11, but fails to disclose the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; and detect an email message if the content of the message is similar to the overall content of the previous messages.

However, in the same art of undesired e-mail filtering, Gordon discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include a mechanism that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; and detect an email message if the content of the message is similar to the overall content of the previous messages (col. 10, lines 53-61, col. 11 lines 16-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldman and Gordon in order to filter undesired e-mails more effectively by using a combination of undesired e-mail filtering methods (authorized, unauthorized, text-based filtering etc., Gordon, col. 1 lines 53-56).

12. Claim 15 is rejected for the same rationale as claim 5.

13. For claims 6 and 24, Goldman further discloses the plurality of detection mechanisms include:

- a first detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email message is not on a list of senders authorized by the user (fig. 4, unconfirmed category includes any sender's address that has not been categorized as authorized, [0044] lines 19-23);
- a second detection mechanism that detects an email message if the sender of the email is on a list of unauthorized senders (fig. 4, unauthorized category, [0052] lines 1-8);
- a third detection mechanism that detects an email message if the email message contains a textual content string that is on a list of unauthorized textual content string ([0006] lines 1-10); and

Goldman does not disclose a forth detection mechanism.

However, Gordon discloses:

- a fourth detection mechanism that is configured to analyze the overall content of previous email messages that have been detected; compare the content of an email message to the overall content and assign a score reflective of a level of similarity for the email message; and detect the email message if the score is higher than a designated score (col. 11, lines 16-32, Bayes filtering identifies words and/or groups of words representing spam in the content of the e-mail and determine a probability-a score of how likely the e-mail is a unwanted one, and compare the score with a user-defined threshold to filter the e-mail as unwanted).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldman and Gordon in order to filter undesired e-mails more effectively by using a combination of undesired e-mail filtering methods (authorized, unauthorized, text-based filtering etc., Gordon, col. 1 lines 53-56).

14. For claim 16, the claim is rejected for the same rationale as claim 6.

15. For claims 10, 18, and 28, Goldman further discloses the email client displays a particular undesired email message in a particular manner that is representative of the particular detection mechanism that detected the particular undesired email message ([0050], lines 19-26).

16. Claims 7, 17, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman and Gordon as applied to claims 6, 16, and 24 above, and further in view of Kosco (US 2004/0181581)

17. For claim 7, in addition to the rejection of claims 6, 16, and 24, Goldman and Gordon further disclose the single graphical interface comprises:

- a first interface mechanism to access the first detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12, accessing and manipulating filtering information is activating detection mechanism);

- a second interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders authorized by the user (Goldman, [0045] lines 18-21, Gordon col. 9 lines 1-7);
- a third interface mechanism to activate the second detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12);
- a fourth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of senders not authorized by the user (Goldman, [0045] lines 18-21, Gordon, col. 9 lines 1-7);
- a fifth interface mechanism to access the third detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12);
- a sixth interface mechanism to activate an interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings (Goldman, [0006] lines 1-10);
- a seventh interface mechanism to access the fourth detection mechanism (Goldman, [0041] lines 10-12), and
- an eighth interface mechanism to adjust the designated score (col. 12, lines 23-26, the threshold is defined by sliding an icon).

Goldman and Gordon do not explicitly disclose activating detection mechanisms.

However, Kosco discloses activating detection mechanisms using checkboxes and radio buttons (fig. 5, e.g. joe@somedomain.com belongs to Allow Domain (or authorized sender), or item 518 enable or disable a detection mechanism).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldman and Gordon with the teachings of Kosco in order to provide the user with more functionality as to turning on/off undesired e-mail filtering mechanisms (such as authorized e-mail sources, blocked e-mails... Kosco [0089]-[0099])

18. Claims 17 and 25 are rejected for the same rationale as claim 7.

19. Claims 8, 9, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldman, Gordon, and Kosco as applied to claims 7 and 25 above, further in view of Gross et al. (US 6,782,510, hereafter Gross)

20. For claim 8, in addition to the rejection of claims 7 and 25, Goldman further discloses a variety of visual mechanisms to represent the categorization of the sender. However, Goldman and Gordon do not explicitly disclose the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings is configured to display a list of the detected textual content strings in particular undesired email message that was detected by the third detection mechanism, the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings further configured to substitute different textual strings for the detected textual content strings.

In the same field of endeavor comprising electronic document word checking, Gross discloses the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings is configured to display a list of the detected textual content strings in particular undesired email message that was detected by the third detection mechanism (col. 8 lines 10-19, fig. 2 items 235 and 240, an alert is given to the user if there is a word that was predefined by the user as inappropriate (by using highlighting the words or other visual, audible warning or both)), the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings further configured to substitute different textual strings for the detected textual content strings (fig. 2 item 245, col. 8 lines 23-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldman, Gordon, and Kosco with the teachings of Gross in order to provide the user with more functionality as to reduce the potential offensive words or sensitive words by substituting these words with words that have the same meaning but less offensive while maintaining appropriateness of the meaning of the word (Gross, col. 8 lines 29-31).

21. For claim 9, Gross further discloses the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings is configured to display a particular undesired email message with the detected textual content strings in the particular undesired email message highlighted so that the user may select a particular highlighted detected textual content string (col. 8 lines 10-19, fig. 2 items 235 and 240, an alert is given to the user if there is a word that was predefined by the user as inappropriate (by using highlighting the words or other visual, audible warning or both)), the interface to edit the list of unauthorized textual content strings being configured to remove the particular highlighted detected textual content string from the unauthorized list of textual content strings (col. 8 lines 25-44, the user can change the status field of the word to make it no more inappropriate in

subsequent checks; in other words, the user can remove the word that he/she thinks appropriate from the inappropriate word list, fig. 2 items 250, 255).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Goldman, Gordon, and Kosco with the teachings of Gross in order to provide the user with more functionality as to reduce the potential offensive words or sensitive words by substituting these words with words that have the same meaning but less offensive while maintaining appropriateness of the meaning of the word (Gross, col. 8 lines 29-31).

22. Claim 26 is rejected for the same rationale as claim 8.

23. Claim 27 is rejected for the same rationale as claim 9.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Chandhok et al. US 2002/0013692. Method of and system for screening electronic mail items.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-

1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

HH

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER